



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/156,334	09/18/1998	RANJIT N. NOTANI	020431.0463	9944

7590 05/03/2004

BAKER & BOTTS
2001 ROSS AVE
DALLAS, TX 752012980

EXAMINER

DIXON, THOMAS A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3629

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/156,334

Applicant(s)

NOTANI ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas A. Dixon

Art Unit

3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10-12, 15-20 and 48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-9, 13-14, 21-47 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10-12, 15-20 and 48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 03/01/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per Claim 1.

Applicant argues that Randell does not disclose predefined executable software function, the predefined functions are seen in lines 3-4 of the abstract and column 2, lines 50-56; and that it's computer system interacts with one of the distributed nodes associated with one of a plurality of physically separated enterprises through performance of the one or more predefined executable software functions at the distributed node, this interaction is seen in the reply from external organization, see column 14, lines 56-61.

As per Claims 5, 48.

Applicant argues that Randell does not disclose review of a preliminary collaboration, the review is evidenced by figure 12 (1222, 1208) the satisfaction with or return of the packet as unaccepted; further applicant argues that Randell does not disclose a final collaboration, the final collaboration can be seen by the satisfaction with the current task and the placement of the of the next node in the work queue, which continues as seen in figure 13 conditional loop and eventually goes to figure 13 (1308) waiting for all nodes to be completed which is seen to be a final collaboration.

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3629

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-7, 10-12, 15-20, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Randell (5,745,687) in view of Teschler.

As per Claim 1.

Randell ('687) discloses:

a computer process operable, when executing on a computer to store the set of predefined functions for the distributed workflow that are to be performed at the plurality of distributed nodes, see figure 10B (1024);

the computer-implemented process operable, when executing on the computer system, to manage the workflow by automatically interacting with the workflow at each of the distributed nodes to perform the predefined functions, see figure 5A (508, 520)

the computer-implemented process operable, when executing on the computer to communicate a first one or more of the predefined functions to the first one of the nodes in connection with performance of the first one or more predefined functions at the first node, interact with the first one of the nodes, see 10A (1011);

the computer-implemented process operable, when executing on the computer system, to communicate a second one or more of the predefined functions to a second one of the nodes, see figure 10A (1011).

Randell ('687) does not specifically disclose the physically separated enterprises.

Teschler teaches a Workflow Interoperability Specification, see page 1, lines 10-24, to allow physically separated enterprises to communicate workflow data for the benefit of sharing tasks between more than one company.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use the Workflow Interoperability Specification to allow physically separated enterprises to communicate workflow data for the benefit of sharing tasks between more than one company.

As per Claim 2.

Art Unit: 3629

Randell ('687) discloses:

the computer process operable, when executing on a computer to store the set of predefined functions for the distributed workflow that are to be performed at the plurality of distributed nodes, see figure 10B (1024);

the computer-implemented process operable, when executing on the computer system, to manage the workflow by automatically interacting with the workflow at each of the distributed nodes to perform the predefined functions, see figure 5A (508, 520).

Randell ('687) does not specifically disclose the workflow between a plurality of enterprises.

Teschler teaches a Workflow Interoperability Specification, see page 1, lines 10-24, to allow physically separated enterprises to communicate workflow data for the benefit of sharing tasks between more than one company.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use the Workflow Interoperability Specification to allow physically separated enterprises to communicate workflow data for the benefit of sharing tasks between more than one company.

As per Claim 3.

Randell ('687) further discloses the communication with an external system, which could be a monitoring system, see column 14, lines 43-64.

As per Claim 4.

Randell ('687) discloses the set of predefined functions are operable to deploy the workflow to the distributed nodes, see 10B (1024).

Randell ('687) does not specifically disclose the workflow between a plurality of enterprises.

Teschler teaches a Workflow Interoperability Specification, see page 1, lines 10-24, to allow physically separated enterprises to communicate workflow data for the benefit of sharing tasks between more than one company.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use the Workflow Interoperability Specification to allow physically separated enterprises to communicate workflow data for the benefit of sharing tasks between more than one company.

As per Claim 5, 48.

Randell ('687) discloses:

receiving at the computer system a preliminary collaboration from a first participant, see figure 12 (enter through satisfied);

automatically transmitting the preliminary collaboration to a second participant, see figure 10A (1012);

receiving a response to the preliminary collaboration from the second participant, see figure 12 (1208, 1222) and figure 14 (1408);

automatically transmit the response from the second participant to the first participant, see figure 10A (1012);

Art Unit: 3629

receiving a response to the response ultimately resulting in a final collaboration based on the preliminary collaboration and optimized from the participants, see figure 12 (1224) and figure 13.

Randell ('687) does not specifically disclose a first and second enterprise.

Teschler teaches a Workflow Interoperability Specification, see page 1, lines 10-24, to allow physically separated enterprises to communicate workflow data for the benefit of sharing tasks between more than one company.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use the Workflow Interoperability Specification to allow physically separated enterprises to communicate workflow data for the benefit of sharing tasks between more than one company.

As per Claim 6, 11.

Randell ('687) further discloses the response comprises a comment, see column 14, lines 38-61.

As per Claim 7, 12.

Randell ('687) further discloses a modification to the preliminary collaboration, see figure 11 (1106).

As per Claim 10, 15.

Randell ('687) discloses:

receiving at the computer system an approval from a first and second participant, see figure 12 (enter through satisfied);

receiving a responses to the collaboration, see figure 12 (1208, 1222) and figure 14 (1406, 1408) and automatically transmitting the responses, see figure 10A (1012)

and further discloses communication with an external system, which could be a third participant, see column 14, lines 43-64.

Randell ('687) does not specifically disclose a first and second enterprise.

Teschler teaches a Workflow Interoperability Specification, see page 1, lines 10-24, to allow physically separated enterprises to communicate workflow data for the benefit of sharing tasks between more than one company.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use the Workflow Interoperability Specification to allow physically separated enterprises to communicate workflow data for the benefit of sharing tasks between more than one company.

As per Claim 16.

Randell ('687) further discloses requesting approval from the other participant (s), see figure 12 (1206 and 1222).

As per Claim 17.

Randell ('687) further discloses in response to approval communicating to a third participant, see figure 14 (1406).

As per Claim 18.

Randell ('687) further discloses receiving responses to the collaboration, see figure 12 (1208, 1222) and figure 14 (1406, 1408) and automatically transmitting the responses, see figure 10A (1012)

As per Claim 19.

Randell ('687) further discloses to transmitting a signal to all enterprises to which involved in the collaboration, see figure 10A (1011).

As per Claim 20.

Randell ('687) discloses:

receiving a first predefined set of data associated with operation of a first portion of the collaboration at a first node, the set of data having been collected in response to an automatic query of the first node for the first set of data, see figure 12 (1202-1206);

automatically transmitting the first set of data to a monitoring system, see column 14, lines 43-64 and figure 14 (1406);

receiving at the computer system a second predefined set of data associated with operation of a second portion of the collaboration, the second data having been collected in response to an automatic query of the second node for the second set of data, see figure 12.

automatically transmitting the second set of data to a monitoring system, see column 14, lines 43-64 and figure 14 (1406);

Randell ('687) does not specifically disclose a first and second enterprise.

Teschler teaches a Workflow Interoperability Specification, see page 1, lines 10-24, to allow physically separated enterprises to communicate workflow data for the benefit of sharing tasks between more than one company.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use the Workflow Interoperability Specification to allow physically separated enterprises to communicate workflow data for the benefit of sharing tasks between more than one company.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas A. Dixon whose telephone number is (703) 305-4645. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 6:30 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (703) 308-2702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Thomas A. Dixon
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3629

April 29, 2004